

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Under the final Office Action mailed on March 25, 2005, claims 1-27 were subject to examination. Claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 20, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tobish, US 5,44,775 ("Tobish"); claims 2-3, 18 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobish in view of Shindo, US 5,898,774 ("Shindo"); claims 10-11, 16, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobish in view of Bianchini, US 4,119,089 ("Bianchini"); claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobish in view of Shindo and in further view of Bianchini; and claims 17, 19, 22, 24 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected claims, but were otherwise found allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of their base and any intervening claims. Claims 4-8 were allowed.

Pursuant to Examiner's comments in the Action and a follow-up telephonic interview, the broad claims, including claims 1-3 and 25 would be considered allowable if rewritten to more "accurately" convey the intended meaning of "bearing a tactile indicator" to represent number keys which physically support tactile indicators rather than to "show" tactile indicators. Claims 1-3 and 25 were subsequently rewritten with minimal changes in a form the Applicant believes more clearly conveys the meaning pursuant to the specification and which addresses the Examiner's concerns. Claims 9-14, dependent from rewritten claim 1, should also overcome the Action's rejections and be allowed for the same reasons.

Claims 17, 19, 22, and 24 have also been rewritten to include all of the limitations of their base and intervening claims and should therefore be allowed pursuant to the Action's objections.

Claims 26-27 were rejected on the same basis as claim 15. Pursuant to the Action, however, Claim 15 would be allowable if directed more narrowly according to the specific embodiment included in dependent claims 17 and 16, which pertain to a transparent and adhesively backed plate structure attached to the number keys. Claims 26-27 have been subsequently rewritten to include the same adhesively backed plate embodiment of claims 17 and 16, and should now also overcome their rejection and be allowed.

Claim 10 was amended to correct an idiomatic informality and does not introduce any "new matter" or new grounds for examination.

Claims 15, 16, 20-21, 23 were canceled.

By way of this amendment, the claims have been amended as suggested and discusse to address the Examiner's concerns with regard to his claim rejections under 35 USC § 102(b) and 35 USC § 103(a) and to place the application in condition for allowance. Although the Applicant does not agree with the need for these changes, they are being made to accommodate the Examiner's rejections and comments and to advance the prosecution of this application to a speedy conclusion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

May 13, 2005

Date



Francis J. Caufield
Registration No. 27,425

Customer Number 30333

6 Apollo Circle
Lexington, MA 02421-7025

Telephone: 781 860 5254
Facsimile: 781 862 9464